

REMARKS

Claims 1- 5 were pending and under consideration.

In the Office Action, Claims 1- 5 were rejected.

In this Amendment, Claim 1 is amended and Claim 2 is cancelled. No new matter has been introduced as a result of this amendment.

Accordingly, Claims 1 - 5 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1- 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Miyachi et al. (Miyachi) (U.S. Patent No. 6,211,937). Although, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the invention and remove any ambiguities that may have been the basis for these rejections.

Claim 1 is directed to a liquid crystal panel. The liquid crystal panel comprises a driving substrate, pixels, signal lines and scanning lines, an alignment film, a counter substrate, a liquid crystal layer, and at least one projection provided in each of the pixels.

Amended Claim 1 recites that “at least one projection provided in each of the pixels at a substantially central position, relative to two opposite boundaries of the corresponding pixel, the two opposite boundaries being parallel to the rubbing direction, the central position being adjacent to a starting position of the rubbing direction and to a boundary not being parallel to the rubbing direction.”

Miyachi fails to disclose or suggest the claimed position of the at least one projection is provided at a central position relative to opposite and parallel boundaries, which is adjacent to a starting position of the rubbing direction and to a boundary not being parallel to the rubbing direction.”.

Miyachi does disclose a plurality of positions of the columnar spacer 5 within the pixel region, as supported by FIGs 1 – 11. However, none of these positions is located at a central position relative to opposite and parallel boundaries while being adjacent to a starting position of the rubbing direction and to a boundary not being parallel to the rubbing direction.

Thus, Miyachi fails to anticipate Claim 1. As such, Claim 1 is allowable over Miyachi. The rejection of Claim 2 is now moot in view of its cancellation.

Applicants respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C 102(b) be withdrawn.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claim 3

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyachi in view of Miura et al. (Miura) (US Patent No. 5,877,836). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In regard to Claim 3 dependent upon Claim 1, Claim 1 has been shown above to be allowable over Miyachi. Moreover, Miura fails to teach or suggest the above discussed distinguishable limitation of Claim 1. Further, no combination of the cited references fairly teaches or suggests the subject matter of Claim 3. Thus, Claim 3 is patentable over the cited references, taken singly or in any combination with each other.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these 103(a) rejections be withdrawn.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claim 4

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyachi in view of Sakamoto (US Patent No. 6,853,421). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In regard to Claim 4, Claim 1 has been shown above to be allowable over Miyachi. Moreover, Miura fails to teach or suggest the above discussed distinguishable limitation of Claim 1. Further, no combination of the cited references fairly teaches or suggests the subject matter of Claim 4. Thus, Claim 4 is patentable over the cited references, taken singly or in any combination with each other.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these 103(a) rejections be withdrawn.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claim 5

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyachi in view of Kaise et al. ("Kaise")(US Patent No. 6,788,372). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In regard to Claim 5, Claim 1 has been shown above to be allowable over Miyachi. Moreover, Kaise fails to teach or suggest the above discussed distinguishable limitation of Claim

1. Further, no combination of the cited references fairly teaches or suggests the subject matter of Claim 5. Thus, Claim 5 is patentable over the cited references, taken singly or in any combination with each other.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these 103(a) rejections be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1 and 3 -5 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 29, 2006

By: /David R. Metzger/

David R. Metzger

Registration No. 32,919

SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. Box 061080

Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080

(312) 876-8000